



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/190,309	11/12/1998	DANIEL R. SCHNEIDEWEND	RCA89.041	6495

7590 12/30/2009  
JOSEPH S TRIPOLI  
PATENT OPERATIONS GE AND RCA  
LICENSING MANAGEMENT OPERATION INC  
PO BOX 5312  
PRINCETON, NJ 085435312

EXAMINER
----------

SALCE, JASON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2421

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/30/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/190,309	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SCHNEIDEWEND ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jason P. Salce	<b>Art Unit</b> 2421	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                       | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/4/2009 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 10/27/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that cumulative rejection should not be made by the Examiner and states that MPEP 706.02(I) states that “Prior art rejections should ordinarily be confined strictly to the best available art”. The Examiner notes that section 706.02(I) does not prohibit an Examiner from applying multiple rejections and that the purpose of the Examiner applying multiple rejections is to expedite prosecution of the instant application considering the age and current status (**being affirmed by the BPAI**) of the instant application. The Examiner notes that instead of applying a single rejection for Applicant (**and possibly in the future, the BPAI**) all possible rejections (**covering all issues**) that could be applied during the entire prosecution of the instant application are presented to Applicant, thereby expediting the prosecution of the instant application.

Applicant further notes that the Examiner seems to have an inaccurate understanding of the meaning of the word “synchronize”. Applicant has provided a dictionary definition of the term “synchronize”, which states, “to cause to indicate the same time, as one timepiece with another”. Applicant further states that in other words, synchronizing a clock with a particular time means *setting or changing the clock to that time*. Therefore, Applicant argues that comparing a clock to a particular time cannot be reasonably interpreted as synchronizing a clock and Young fails to teach changing the system clock prior to initiation of the processing function. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the definition provided by Applicant does not require any “setting” or “changing”, only an indication (“**to indicate**”). The Examiner further notes that the claims fail to state at what point in the process a system clock is changed, therefore, Young is not required to teach changing the system clock *prior to initiation of the processing function*.

Note that the claims in the instant application state, “**wherein the first current time reference information provides information for synchronizing a scheduling clock with a clock of the first corresponding program source**”. The claims only state that a first/second time reference provides information used for synchronizing a scheduling clock with a clock of the first corresponding program source.

As stated in the previous Office Action Young discloses receiving first and second time reference information in the form of EPG information specifying what times programs are to be broadcasted to viewers, wherein each program represents a single piece of current time reference information (**see Column 12, Lines 58-61 and Page 5**

Art Unit: 2421

**of the previous Office Action**). Young further discloses that the current time reference information is used by the user to request a program recording, which then uses the current time reference information **(the time defined in the EPG indicating what time the requested program will be recorded)** to set **(synchronize)** a scheduling clock/time to the system clock 230 at the time the program was requested to be recorded **(see Column 12, Line 58 through Column 13, Line 24)**.

Further note that not only does Young teach that the EPG information that contains current time reference information, Young further teaches transmitting last minute schedule change data, so that recording of programs are more accurate by updating the schedule time of a program in case a previous program on the same channel runs longer than scheduled **(see Column 13, Lines 3-8)**.

In regards to Applicant's arguments regarding Marsh and Schein, Applicant argues that Marsh does not show comparison of times and does not actually disclose or suggest synchronizing a clock prior to initiating a processing function. See the Examiner's rebuttal above for Young meeting the claim limitation "synchronizing". Schein is only used to teach receiving time data from multiple sources.

In regards to claims 3 and 18, Applicant argues that Roop fails to teach preventing a discontinuity and notes that changing a time for daylight savings causes a time discontinuity and does not prevent a time discontinuity. While the concept of changing daylight savings time may cause a time discontinuity on a global scale, in view

Art Unit: 2421

of the Young and Roop references as a whole, if daylight savings is not compensated for while broadcasting stations have compensated for daylight savings time, a time discontinuity is introduced. Therefore, by Roop indicating such a discontinuity and correcting the discontinuity, all programs broadcasted after daylight savings will be recorded at the proper times, therefore a discontinuity is prevented.

Regarding claims 7 and 12, see the Examiner rebuttal above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10-11, 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268).

Referring to claim 1, Young discloses a processor (**see Figures 22A and 22B and Column 12, Lines 38-52**) for providing an EPG (**see Figure 1**), wherein the television receiver includes a processor (**see CPU 228 in Figure 22A**) and stores a program schedule (**see Column 12, Lines 64-67**), the EPG operable by a user to select a first program and a second program (**see Figure 1**) received from corresponding program sources (**see Figure 1 for the first program NEWS coming from**

**channel/source CNN and the second program Jane Wallace coming from channel/source LIF (Lifetime channel)) and to select a first program processing function for the first program and to select a second program processing function for the second program (see Figure 2 and Column 5, Lines 37-38 and Column 7, Lines 24-30 for selecting programs to be recorded).**

Young also discloses a tuner (**see tuner 202 in Figure 22A**) operable by the processor to receive for the first program, first current time reference information from a first corresponding program source (**see Column 12, Lines 58-61 for receiving EPG information and Figure 1 for the EPG information containing programs, which are displayed for a specific time period (for example see Figure 1 for Lunch Box being broadcast at 12:00 PM) from a particular programming source (see Figure 1 for channel CNN, which is a broadcast source)**), wherein the first current time reference information provides information for synchronizing a scheduling clock with a clock of the first corresponding program source (**see Column 12, Line 58 through Column 13, Line 24 for using the incoming EPG information (which includes current time reference information for each program from each program (channel) source)**) to synchronize the scheduling clock (**clock used to determine when to trigger a recording event**) with a clock of the first corresponding program source (**the time in the EPG data used to determine what time and channel to start the recording function**)).

Young also discloses that the tuner operable by the processor also receives for the second program, second current time reference information from a second

Art Unit: 2421

corresponding program source (**see again Column 12, Lines 58-61 and Figure 1 Jane Wallace being broadcast from source LIF at 11:00 AM**), wherein the second current time reference information provides information for synchronizing a scheduling clock with a clock of the first corresponding program source (**see Column 12, Line 58 through Column 13, Line 24 for using the incoming EPG information (*which includes current time reference information for each program from each program (channel) source*) to synchronize the scheduling clock (clock used to determine when to trigger a recording event) with a clock of the first corresponding program source (the time in the EPG data used to determine what time and channel to start the recording function). Further note Figure 4, which shows that multiple programs on multiple channels can be scheduled for recording, therefore a first and second program with two different clocks from two different sources can provide information for synchronizing a scheduling clock.**

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to synchronize the current time of day of a first scheduling clock with the current time of day of the clock of the first corresponding program source based on the first current time reference information (**see Column 13, Lines 14-17 for saving the record time in RAM 236 and Column 13, Lines 17-22 for executing a record function when both times are compared and the system determines that the two times matched, therefore synchronizing a current time of day of a first scheduling clock that is synchronized with current time of day of the clock of the first program source (sent in the EPG data).**



Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to initiate the first program processing function based upon the synchronized first scheduling clock (**see Column 13, Lines 17-22**).

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to initiate the second program processing function based upon the second scheduling clock (**see Column 13, Lines 17-22**).

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to ensure that the second scheduling clock is synchronized with the current time of day of the clock of the second corresponding program source prior to initiation of the second program processing function by synchronizing the current time of day of the second scheduling clock with the current time of day of the clock of the second corresponding program source based on the second current time reference information prior to initiation of the second program processing function (**Column 13, Lines 3-8 for providing a schedule update time/clock 230 update data that represents an updated current time of day (from a first program source) for when a recording operation will be executed and Column 13, Lines 17-22 for synchronizing a system clock 230 (current time of day of a first scheduling clock) with the requested/scheduled time (current time of day of the clock of the first corresponding program source) in order to execute a recording operation**). *The Examiner further notes that Young teaches that the system is capable of scheduling more than one television program for recording (see Figure 4) and therefore a first, second or even a third current time of day clock of a first, second or third programming source, respectively, can be*

Art Unit: 2421

*compared to a system clock or updated system clock 230 in order to execute a recording/program processing function. Further note that by comparing the two times/clocks to determine if a recording function should be initiated, the system inherently does so prior to initiation of the second program processing function, as claimed, because the recording function will not be executed if an affirmative comparison is made. Further note Figure 4, which shows that multiple programs on multiple channels can be scheduled for recording, therefore a first and second program with two different clocks from two different sources can provide information for synchronizing a scheduling clock.*

Referring to claims 2, Young discloses that the current time reference information (the start and end time of a program in the received EPG data (see *the rejection of claim 1*)) provides a current time-of-day indication (see again Figure 1 for NEWS starting at 11:00 AM, which is a current time of day (*the time the program is currently being broadcasted*)).

Referring to claim 4, Young discloses that the first programming processing function is at least one selected from the group consisting of a record function (see *the rejection of claim 1*).

Referring to claim 5, Young discloses that the group of claim 4, further consists program decoding (see **Column 13, Lines 60-61**).

Referring to claim 6, Young discloses that the processor is programmed to terminate the second program processing function based upon the second scheduling clock (**see Column 13, Lines 14-22 for recording a program according to it's start time and length, wherein the length allows the processor to calculate when to stop the recording at the end of the television program**).

Referring to claim 10, see the rejection of claim 2.

Referring to claim 11, see the rejection of claim 1 for providing a scheduling clock, which is a setting to record a television program, which indicates what time and day to record a program.

Referring to claim 13, Young discloses that the tuner is operable to receive the first current time reference information from a first corresponding program source that is a broadcast source (**see Column 12, Lines 58-62**).

Referring to claim 14, Young discloses that the system comprises a central scheduling clock (**see Column 13, Lines 3-24**).

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to provide the first scheduling clock by updating the central scheduling clock with time information generated based on the first current time reference information (**see Column 13, Lines 14-24**).

Young also discloses that the processor is programmed to provide the second scheduling clock by updating the central scheduling clock with time information generated based on the first current time reference information (**see Column 13, Lines 14-24**).

Referring to claim 15, Young discloses that the processor is programmed to simultaneously maintain, for at least a period of time, both the first and second scheduling clock (**see again Column 13, Lines 13-24 for maintaining the scheduled times (*first and second scheduling clock for a first and second program, respectively*) until the system clock 230 matches the scheduled program times (*transmitted with the EPG information*)**).

Referring to claims 16-17, see the rejection of claims 1-2.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,799) in view of Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,801,787).

Referring to claim 1, Marsh discloses a processor for providing an electronic program guide (**EPG**), the EPG operable by a user (1) to select a first program and a second program received from corresponding program sources and (2) to select a first program processing function for the first program and (3) to select a second program processing function for the second program (**see processor 25 in set-top box 11 in Figure 2 and Column 1, Lines 20-30 for the set-top box enabling a user to select multiple programs for recording through an EPG**).

Marsh also discloses a tuner operable by the processor to receive (2) for the first program, first current time reference information from a first corresponding program source, wherein the first current time reference information provides information for synchronizing a scheduling clock with a clock of the first corresponding program source, and (2) for the second program, second current time reference information from a second corresponding program source, wherein the second current time reference information provides information for synchronizing a scheduling clock with a clock of the first corresponding program source (**see Column 1, Line 20 through Column 2, Line 14 for receiving first and second current time reference information (IPG information) from a single server or headend (see Figure 1)**).

Marsh also discloses that the processor is programmed to synchronize the current time of day of a first scheduling clock with the current time of day of the clock of

Art Unit: 2421

the first corresponding program source based on the first current time reference information (**see Column 10, Lines 36-55 and Figure 7**).

Marsh also discloses that the processor is programmed to initiate the first program processing function based upon the synchronized first scheduling clock (**see Column 10, Lines 56-60 and Figure 7**).

Marsh also discloses that the processor programmed to initiate the second program processing function based upon a second scheduling clock (**see Column 10, Lines 36-55 and Figure 7**).

Marsh also discloses that the processor is programmed to ensure that the second scheduling clock is synchronized with the current time of day of the clock of the first corresponding program source prior to initiation of the second program processing function by synchronizing the current time of day of the second scheduling clock with the current time of day of the clock of the first corresponding program source based on the second current time reference information prior to initiation of the second program processing function (**see Column 10, Lines 56-60 and Figure 7**).

Marsh fails to teach receiving a clock of a second corresponding program source.

Schein teaches receiving current time/clock/EPG data from first and second programming sources (**see Column 4, Lines 25-63**), and using the EPG data to schedule program recordings (**see Column 6, Lines 40-44**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the recording system, as taught by Marsh, to receive EPG/clock/current time data from multiple programming sources, as taught by Schein,

Art Unit: 2421

for the purpose of allowing a user to easily select shows (**transmitted from multiple television program sources**) for viewing or recordation (**see Column 1, Lines 64-65 of Schein**).

Referring to claim 16, see the rejection of claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268) in view of Roop et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,274).

Referring to claim 3, Young discloses that the system further comprises a display for displaying a current time-of-day to a user (**see the current time 11:25A being displayed to a user in Figure 1**)

Young fails to disclose that the processor is operable to provide an output for updating the display of the current time-of-day based upon the first current time reference information and a filter for filtering the output to inhibit a discontinuous change

Art Unit: 2421

in the current time reference information from causing a discontinuous change in the display of the current time-of-day and for providing the filtered output to the display.

Roop discloses a filter for filtering said output such that any discontinuity in the current time reference information is prevented and displaying the updated time to the user (**see the Daylight Savings Time Change Command in Column 39 and note that automatically changing the current time according to the corrected Daylight Savings time prevents any possible discontinuity**), and providing said filtered output to said display (**see Column 40, Lines 19-22**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify EPG data receiving system, as taught by Young, to include the daylight savings data, as taught by Roop, for the purpose of displaying schedule data for time periods that contain the correct adjusted local time (**see Column 40, Lines 21-22 of Roop**).

Referring to claim 18, see the rejection of claim 3.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268) in view of the Program and System Information Protocol for Terrestrial Broadcast and Cable document (herein referred to as the ATSC document) in further view of Landis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,561,461).



Referring to claim 7, Young discloses that the tuner is operable to receive EPG data from various types of means and further notes that “Other means of delivering schedule information can be employed, including the use of a subcarrier channel on the cable service”, however, Young fails to teach that the tuner receives STT data that includes a time reference indicator and associated correction data sufficient to establish a time of transmission of a program by a corresponding broadcast source accurate to within about plus or minus 4 seconds.

The ATSC document teaches that a current time reference information comprises a System Time Table (**SST**) data of an MPEG compliant data stream (**see Pages 1 and 11-12**), and wherein said stored program schedule is derived from an Event Information Table (**EIT**) of an MPEG compliant data stream (**see Pages 1 and 11-12**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the data transmitted from the servers in packetized form, as taught by Roop, to adhere to the MPEG standard with STT and EIT tables, for the purpose of providing a collection of hierarchically arranged tables for describing system information and program guide data (**see Page 11, Lines 1-2 of the ATSC document**).

Young and the ATSC document fail to teach that the time of transmission is correct to within about plus or minus 4 seconds.

Art Unit: 2421

Landis also discloses a television receiver that is capable of receiving a time correction command, which is accurate to within seconds, therefore teaching accurate to within about plus or minus 4 seconds (**see Column 3, Lines 1-7**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the television receiver, as taught by Roop and the ATSC document, using the enhanced television receiver that receives a time correction command, as taught by Landis, for the purpose of maintaining accurate time (**see Column 6, Lines 6-8 of Landis**).

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268) in view of the Program and System Information Protocol for Terrestrial Broadcast and Cable document (herein referred to as the ATSC document).

Referring to claim 12, Young discloses that the tuner is operable to receive EPG data from various types of means and further notes that “Other means of delivering schedule information can be employed, including the use of a subcarrier channel on the cable service”, however, Young fails to teach that the first and second current time reference information comprises STT data of an MPEG compliant data stream, and the stored program schedule is derived from an EIT of an MPEG compliant data stream.

The ATSC document teaches that a current time reference information comprises a System Time Table (**SST**) data of an MPEG compliant data stream (**see**

Art Unit: 2421

**Pages 1 and 11-12**), and wherein said stored program schedule is derived from an Event Information Table (**EIT**) of an MPEG compliant data stream (**see Pages 1 and 11-12**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the data transmitted to the television receivers, as taught by Young, to adhere to the MPEG standard with STT and EIT tables, for the purpose of providing a collection of hierarchically arranged tables for describing system information and program guide data (**see Page 11, Lines 1-2 of the ATSC document**).

Claims 8-9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,479,268) in view of Usui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,694).

Referring to claim 8, Young discloses that the tuner is operable to receive first current time reference information that is based on a first time-of-day clock, and that the tuner is operable to receive second current time reference information, however, Young is silent as to receiving EPG information (**second current time reference information**) based on a second time-of-day clock, with the second time-of-day clock being unsynchronized with the first time-of-day clock.

Usui teaches receiving first and second current time reference information (**EPG information**) from two separate sources (**see Column 17, Lines 8-22 and Figure 22**).

Further note that Usui teaches that in the U.S.A. that time information is included in the

Art Unit: 2421

EPG information (**see Column 5, Lines 45-51 and Column 17, Line 60 through Column 18, Line 5**), therefore the first and second current time reference information (**EPG information transmitted from separate source**) are clearly based on a first and second time-of-day clock, wherein the clocks are inherently unsynchronized because they are transmitted from two distinct sources/locations.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the television receiver, as taught by Young, using the multiple EPG receiver functionality, as taught by Usui, for the purpose of allowing operability to be improved and a desired program to be selected in a short time and at a high degree of reliability (**see Column 18, Lines 18-20 of Usui**).

Referring to claim 9, see the rejection of claim 8.

Referring to claim 19, see the rejection of claim 8.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2421

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Salce whose telephone number is (571) 272-7301. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason P Salce/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2421

Jason P Salce  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2421

December 28, 2009